



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,496	09/01/2006	Alain Rhelimi	09669/093001	1844

22511 7590 03/31/2011
OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
TWO HOUSTON CENTER
909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

DOAN, TRANG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2431

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/31/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com
hathaway@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,496

Applicant(s)

RHEIMI ET AL.

Examiner

TRANG DOAN

Art Unit

2431

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 16 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 15 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 November 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 01/07/2011.
2. Claim 1 has been amended.
3. Claims 1-21 are pending for consideration.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4-5, 13 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fruhauf et al. (US6883715) (hereinafter Fruhauf), and further in view of Hosokawa (US20030053483) (hereinafter Hosokawa).
7. Regarding claim 1, Fruhauf discloses a retrievable token comprising: at least one physical channel of communication to at least one apparatus (Fruhauf: see figure 3); a first logical channel of communication to the at least one apparatus, wherein the first logical channel is associated with the at least one physical channel, wherein the first logical channel is associated with a first protocol stack and a first execution environment

on the retrievable token (Fruhauf: column 7 lines 45-56 and column 10 lines 55-67); and a second logical channel of communication to the at least one apparatus, wherein the second logical channel is associated with the at least one physical channel, wherein the second logical channel is associated with a second protocol stack and a second execution environment on the retrievable token (Fruhauf: column 8 lines 48-52 and column 10 lines 55-67).

Fruhauf does not disclose wherein the retrievable token is configured to concurrently execute the first execution environment and the second execution environment, and wherein executing the first execution environment comprises executing the first protocol stack and executing the second execution environment comprises executing the second protocol stack. However, Hosokawa discloses wherein the retrievable token is configured to concurrently execute the first execution environment and the second execution environment, and wherein executing the first execution environment comprises executing the first protocol stack and executing the second execution environment comprises executing the second protocol stack (Hosokawa: paragraph 0014). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Fruhauf the feature of Hosokawa as discussed above to save the execution time when the two protocols execute at the same time.

8. Regarding claim 4, Fruhauf as modified discloses wherein the at least one apparatus is a personal computer (Fruhauf: see figures 1-2).

9. Regarding claim 5, Fruhauf as modified discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to use USB protocol (Fruhauf: see figure 3).

10. Regarding claim 13, Fruhauf as modified discloses wherein said retrievable token includes at least two physical channels and at least one of said physical channels is independent from the other(s) (Fruhauf: see figure 3).

11. Regarding claim 20, Fruhauf as modified discloses wherein the retrievable token is configured to execute the first application and the second application simultaneously (Hosokawa: paragraph 0014).

12. Regarding claim 21, Fruhauf as modified discloses wherein the retrievable token is configured to implement a communication protocol between the first application and the second application, wherein the communication protocol enables secure sharing of data and/or functions between the first application and the second application (Hosokawa: paragraph 0014).

13. Claims 2-3 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fruhauf in view of Hosokawa, and further in view of Nagamasa et al (US 20040177215) (hereinafter Nagamasa).

14. Regarding claim 2, Fruhauf in view of Hosokawa does not disclose wherein the retrievable token is a Multi Media Memory card. However, Nagamasa discloses wherein the retrievable token is a Multi Media Memory card (Nagamasa: paragraph 0042). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Fruhauf in view of Hosokawa the feature of

Nagamasa as discussed above because in order to realize the full range of benefits offered by the advanced smart card operating environment, inter-application functionality and communication must be facilitated. That is, one application must be able to call another application during a session. Further, applications must be able to securely communicate to another within the smart card operating environment.

15. Regarding claim 3, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein the at least one apparatus is a mobile communication handset (Nagamasa: paragraph 0042).

16. Regarding claim 6, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to use SPI protocol (Nagamasa: paragraph 0061).

17. Regarding claim 7, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to use MMC protocol (Nagamasa: paragraph 0042).

18. Regarding claim 8, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to use a protocol for contactless smart card (Nagamasa: paragraph 0001: flash memory).

19. Regarding claim 9, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein the protocol of communication is defined in the ISO (FCD) 15693 (Nagamasa: paragraph 0046).

20. Regarding claim 10, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein the protocol is defined in the ISO 14443 (Nagamasa: paragraph 0051).

21. Regarding claim 11, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein said at least one physical channel is configured to use at least one protocol defined in the TS 102.221 standard (Nagamasa: paragraph 0109).

22. Regarding claim 12, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein said at least one physical channel is configured to use at least one protocol defined in the ISO 7816 standard (Nagamasa: paragraph 0094).

23. Claims 16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fruhauf in view of Hosokawa, and further in view of Wilkinson et al. (US 20030023954) (hereinafter Wilkinson).

24. Regarding claim 16, Fruhauf in view of Hosokawa does not disclose wherein the resource is a shared file, and wherein said access conditions of the access conditions list (ACL) associates respective applications with respective operations on the shared file thereby authorizing said respective applications to perform said respective operations on the shared file. However, Wilkinson discloses wherein the resource is a shared file, and wherein said access conditions of the access conditions list (ACL) associates respective applications with respective operations on the shared file thereby authorizing said respective applications to perform said respective operations on the shared file (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0117 and 0132). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Fruhauf in view of Hosokawa the feature of Wilkinson as discussed above because the access control list furnishes an indication of types of access to be granted

to the identity, and based on the access control list, the processor selectively grants specific types of access (Wilkinson: paragraph 0024).

25. Regarding claim 18, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein the retrievable token stores and runs an operating system which is common to the first application and the second application and wherein the resource is a shared function that is implemented by the operating system and for which access conditions are defined in the access conditions list (ACL) which specify respective rights of the applications to invoke said shared function (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0117 and 0128-0129).

26. Regarding claim 19, Fruhauf as modified further discloses wherein the first application is configured to share a function with the second application by allowing the second application to invoke the function and where access conditions list (ACL) are defined in the retrievable token for the second application to access the shared function (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0128-0129).

Allowable Subject Matter

27. Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including claims 14-15 because claim 17 is depended on them.

Conclusion

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRANG DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0740. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2431

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Trang Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Kaveh Abrishamkar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431